

To: Tanaka, Joan[Tanaka.Joan@epa.gov]; Fitz-James, Schatzi[Fitz-James.Schatzi@epa.gov]; Stalcup, Dana[Stalcup.Dana@epa.gov]
From: Woolford, James
Sent: Wed 4/19/2017 3:25:39 PM
Subject: FW: PFAS Testing - disclosure examples
[Brunswick.pdf](#)
[HoosickFalls.pdf](#)
[Pease.pdf](#)
[Plattsburghexample1.pdf](#)
[Plattsburghexample2.pdf](#)
[rags_a no tox values.pdf](#)
[Warminster.pdf](#)
[coakleylandfill.pdf](#)
[OTISAFB.pdf](#)

Jim Woolford, Director
Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation
Office of Land and Emergency Management
US Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Penn. Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20460
(Mail Code 5201-P)

Our mission is to return the most contaminated areas of country to communities for safe reuse in a healthy environment.

Phone: (703) 603 8960– Main Office Line

Physically located at:

Room 5622
One Potomac Yard (South)
2777 S. Crystal Dr.
Arlington, VA 22202



From: Bertrand, Charlotte
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 4:42 PM
To: Woolford, James <Woolford.James@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: PFAS Testing - disclosure examples

From: Bertrand, Charlotte
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 5:05 PM
To: 'Sullivan, Maureen SES OSD OUSD ATL (US)' <maureen.sullivan18.civ@mail.mil>
Subject: RE: PFAS Testing - disclosure examples

Maureen –

Attached to this email are example notifications to homeowners at both Federal and private cleanup sites (names/addresses are redacted). The private sites are Hoosick Falls and Coakley Landfill. All the letters provide results to the homeowners for more than PFOA/PFOS – generally six to more than 20 PFAS's. To your question regarding what was said about PFAS's that don't have health

ED_001670_00042751-00001

advisories - each letter is a little different in the presentation/discussion of the results. Some are silent, the Otis AFB letter states that only HA's exist for PFOA/PFOS, and the Coakley landfill refers individuals to the NH Department of Health and Human Services online FAQs. I also looked to see what guidances we have that cover this topic. There is established guidance that the absences of toxicity values should not necessarily preclude chemicals as "chemicals of potential concern." Chemicals without toxicity values may need to be discussed as part of the uncertainty analysis for the baseline risk assessment. I've attached excerpts from Superfunds Risk Assessment Guidelines Part A. Also, EPA's "Soil Screening Guidance: User's Guide Second Edition (July 1996)" makes the following statement: "This guidance provides the information needed to calculate SSLs for 110 chemicals. Sufficient information may not be available to develop soil screening levels *for additional chemicals. These chemicals should not be screened out*, but should be addressed in the baseline risk assessment for the site." I hope this helps, look forward to talking to you more.

Best, Charlotte

From: Sullivan, Maureen SES OSD OUSD ATL (US) [<mailto:maureen.sullivan18.civ@mail.mil>]

Sent: Friday, April 07, 2017 9:33 AM

To: Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>

Subject: PFAS Testing - disclosure examples

Charlotte

Did you ever find some examples of notifications to communities/home owners about drinking water testing that include the suite of PFAS? Also, what was said about the PFAS' that don't have Health Advisories?

Thanks,
Maureen

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone.